

## REMARKS

Claims 1 – 19, 21 – 35, and 39 – 57 are pending in the application. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the allowance of claims 39 – 57. Claims 1 – 19, and 21 – 35 have been rejected. Claim 5 have been objected to. Claims 1 – 3, 5, and 39 have been amended. The amendments to claims 1 – 3 and 39 are supported by the specification as filed, and no new matter is presented. Claim 5 has been amended as requested by the Examiner to overcome the objection. Favorable reconsideration in light of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

### ***Claims 1 – 7, 12, 14 – 19, and 25 – 33 Are Novel Over DeCamp et al***

Claims 1 – 7, 12, 14 – 19, and 25 – 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over DeCamp et al (US Pat# 5,792,099). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

DeCamp neither teaches nor suggests a microcatheter system, “wherein the microcatheter system comprises a flexible cannula mounted in a second cannula, wherein the flexible cannula and the second cannula are adapted to be inserted into the eye.” See column 4, lines 23 – 31 of Decamp, wherein DeCamp teaches that the larger diameter portion 36 is **connected to an end** of the second section 40. Thus, the second section is not mounted in the larger diameter portion. As DeCamp does not teach each and every claim element, the present claims are novel over DeCamp. Accordingly, applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

### ***Claims 1 – 7, 12, 14 – 16, 19, 21, and 23 – 33 Are Novel Over Grinblat et al***

Claims 1 – 7, 12, 14 – 16, 19, 21, and 23 – 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Grinblat et al (US Pat# 5,545,153). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Grinblat et al neither teach nor suggest a microcatheter system wherein the flexible cannula and the second cannula are adapted to be inserted into the eye. See Col. 4, lines 14 – 31, wherein Grinblat et al teach that tube 26 is preferable 20mm OD and that plate 28 is adapted to be removalby sewn to the eyeball at the start of the operation. From this teaching, one of skill in the art would understand that tube 26 was to remain on the outside of the eyeball and is not

adapted to be inserted into the eye because it is too large and would be prevented from doing so by the plate member 28. Thus, Grinblat does not teach each and every claim element, the present claims are novel over Grinblat. Accordingly, applicants request the withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claims.

***Claims 1 – 4, 12 – 16, 19, 21 – 23 and 25 – 33 Are Novel Over Le et al***

Claims 1 – 4, 12 – 16, 19, 21 – 23 and 25 – 33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Le et al (US Pat#6,355,027) in view of applicant's own disclosure. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The claims as amended require, “the flexible cannula and the second cannula are adapted to be inserted into the eye.” Nowhere does Le disclose, teach or suggest a “flexible cannula and the second cannula are adapted to be inserted into the eye.” For example, see Col. 2, lines 51 – 58, wherein Le teaches that catheter tube 16 can range from 100 to 160 cm in length. Thus, the strain relief 14, which is not a second cannula according to the instant claims, is not in anyway adapted to be inserted into the eye. The device of Le is not capable of performing the claimed function of the instant device as suggested by the Examiner.

As Le does not disclose, teach or suggest each claim limitation, and it is impermissible for the Examiner to cite Applicants’ own disclosure against applicant to teach the missing elements, Applicants’ claims are non-obvious over Le.

Accordingly, claims 1 – 4, 12 – 16, 19, 21 – 23 and 25 – 33 are patentable over Le, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

***Claim 8 Is Novel Over DeCamp et al***

Claim 8 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over DeCamp. As discussed above, claims 1 – 3 are novel over DeCamp because DeCamp does not teach or suggest a microcatheter system wherein the flexible cannula and the second cannula are adapted to be inserted into the eye, thus claim 8 is novel over DeCamp. Accordingly, applicants request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of the claim.

***Claims 8 – 11 and 17 – 18 Are Novel Over Le et al***

Claims 8 – 11 and 17 – 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Le. Applicants respectfully traverse for the reasons set forth above regarding Le.

As Le does not teach or suggest each claim limitation, and it is impermissible for the Examiner to cite Applicants' own disclosure against applicant to teach the missing elements, Applicants' claims are non-obvious over Le.

Accordingly, claims 8 – 11 and 17 – 18 are patentable over Le, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

***Claims 34 and 35 Are Novel Over Le et al In View of Castora et al***

Claims 34 and 35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Le in view of Castora (US Pat # 5,947,296). The Examiner asserts that Castora discloses a catheter kit with multiple catheters packaged in one kit and that it would have been obvious to package the catheter of Le as per the organization of Castora. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As stated above, Le does not disclose, teach or suggest each of Applicants' claim limitations. Castora, like Le, does not disclose, teach or suggest, "the flexible cannula and the second cannula are adapted to be inserted into the eye." Thus, Castora does not cure the deficiencies of Le. Therefore, the present claims are novel over Le in view of Castora. Accordingly, claims 34 and 35 are patentable over Le in view of Castora, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

The Office indicates that claims 39 – 57 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and the include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 39 was amended to include the limitations of claim 1 and as claim 1 is allowable, thus, so are claims 39 - 57. Accordingly, claims 39 – 57 are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### CONCLUSION

It is believed that the application is in condition for immediate allowance, and Applicants respectfully request early favorable action by the Examiner.

Applicants believe that additional fees are not required in connection with the consideration of the within matter. However, if for any reason a fee is required, a fee paid is inadequate or credit is owed for any excess fee paid, you are hereby authorized and requested to charge Deposit Account No. **04-1105**.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the amendments and/or remarks made herein, the undersigned attorney would appreciate the opportunity to do so.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 21, 2004

Customer No.: 21874



---

Stephana E. Patton (Reg. No. 50,373)  
EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP  
P.O. Box 55874  
Boston, MA 02205  
Telephone: 617-439-4444  
Facsimile: 617-439-4170